

Limits on Weak Magnetic Confinement of Neutral Atoms

C. A. Sackett

*Physics Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904**

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

It is shown that when a magnetic field is used to support neutral atoms against the gravitational force mg , the total curvature of the field magnitude B must be larger than $m^2g^2/(2\mu^2B)$, where μ is the magnetic moment of the atoms. This limits the minimum confinement strength obtainable for a trapped atomic gas. It is also conjectured that the curvature must be larger than twice this value for a magnetic potential that varies in only one or two dimensions, such as an atomic waveguide.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Be, 41.20.Gz, 39.20.+q

Magnetic trapping of neutral atoms has become a key technique for the production and study of Bose-Einstein condensation and other ultra-cold atomic phenomena. It is therefore not surprising that considerable effort has gone into designing trap configurations with various advantages [1, 2]. In most cases, the trap is used to support the atoms against gravity and to maintain a density high enough for evaporative cooling. For this reason, much attention is paid to making magnetic traps that are as tight and efficient as possible. However, in some situations, tight confinement is not desired. For instance, by adiabatically expanding a condensate into a weak trap, extremely low temperatures can be obtained [3, 4]. Such low temperatures can be useful, for instance, for studying quantum reflection [5] or for probing atomic interactions very near a Feshbach resonance [6, 7]. The low density achievable in a weak trap may also be useful for atom interferometry and other applications where atomic interactions are undesirable [8, 9, 10]. It might be supposed that making a weak trap would be comparatively easy, but this paper shows that a minimum amount of confinement is required if the atoms are to remain supported against gravity.

The total potential energy of an atom at position $\mathbf{x}$ in a gravitational field $\mathbf{g}$ and magnetic field $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x})$ is [11]

$$U(\mathbf{x}) = mgx_1 + m_F g_F \mu_B |\mathbf{B}| \quad (1)$$

where the x_1 axis is vertical. Here m is the atomic mass, m_F is the magnetic quantum number, g_F is the Landé g -factor for the atomic state, and μ_B is the Bohr magneton. For convenience, abbreviate $\mu = m_F g_F \mu_B$. Support against gravity evidently requires that the gradient $\nabla|\mathbf{B}|$ be equal to $-(mg/\mu)\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1$ at the desired trap location. More generally, suppose a requirement that $\nabla|\mathbf{B}| = \mathbf{c}$ for some specified vector $\mathbf{c}$.

Typically, the potential will have a quadratic dependence near the trapping location, described by the curvature matrix

$$K_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} |\mathbf{B}|. \quad (2)$$

with eigenvalues κ_i . Dependence other than quadratic is also possible [12]. Linear dependence, such as that near the zero of a spherical quadrupole, can be interpreted as the limit $\kappa_i \rightarrow \infty$ for two or three κ_i 's. Higher-order variations of the field may be important as well, although the results here show that quadratic dependence in at least one direction is always present if $\mathbf{c} \neq 0$.

Assuming that the quadratic dependence is most relevant, the magnetic field will provide three-dimensional harmonic confinement if $\mu\kappa_i > 0$ for all i . If so, then the atomic oscillation frequencies are given by

$$\omega_i^2 = \frac{\mu\kappa_i}{m}. \quad (3)$$

Wing has shown that the Laplacian $\nabla^2|\mathbf{B}|$ cannot be negative [13, 14]. Since this is the trace of K , at least one of the κ_i must be nonnegative, yielding the familiar result that it is not possible to trap atoms with $\mu < 0$ using a static field. It is shown here that the need for $\nabla|\mathbf{B}|$ to be nonzero provides a more stringent constraint on $\nabla^2|\mathbf{B}|$ than Wing's theorem alone.

To evaluate $\nabla^2|\mathbf{B}|$, note

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} |\mathbf{B}| &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(\sum_i B_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}|} \sum_i B_i \frac{\partial B_i}{\partial x_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_j^2} |\mathbf{B}| &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}|} \sum_i \left(\frac{\partial B_i}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}|} \sum_i B_i \frac{\partial^2 B_i}{\partial x_j^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}|^3} \left(\sum_i B_i \frac{\partial B_i}{\partial x_j} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Summing over all j yields

$$\nabla^2|\mathbf{B}| = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}|} \left[\sum_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial B_i}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 + \mathbf{B} \cdot (\nabla^2 \mathbf{B}) - (\nabla|\mathbf{B}|)^2 \right] \quad (6)$$

where (4) was used in the last term. Since the field satisfies Maxwell's equations, $\nabla^2 \mathbf{B} = 0$. Using $\nabla|\mathbf{B}| = \mathbf{c}$

*Electronic address: sackett@virginia.edu

leaves

$$\nabla^2 |\mathbf{B}| = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}|} \left[\sum_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial B_i}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 - c^2 \right] = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}|} \left(\sum_{ij} J_{ij}^2 - c^2 \right). \quad (7)$$

where $c = |\mathbf{c}|$ and the Jacobian matrix J is defined by

$$J_{ij} = \frac{\partial B_i}{\partial x_j}. \quad (8)$$

Since $\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = 0$, J is symmetric, and since $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$, the trace of J is zero.

The Jacobian is also related to the gradient of $|\mathbf{B}|$. From (4)

$$(\nabla |\mathbf{B}|)_j = \sum_i b_i \frac{\partial B_i}{\partial x_j} = \sum_i b_i J_{ij} = c_j \quad (9)$$

where the vector $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{B}/|\mathbf{B}|$ has magnitude one. Since J is real and symmetric, it is possible to simplify (9) by working in a basis where J is diagonal, with eigenvalues λ_i . In this basis, denoted by a tilde, (9) becomes

$$\lambda_i \tilde{b}_i = \tilde{c}_i \quad (10)$$

for $i = 1$ to 3. Thus

$$\sum_i \lambda_i^2 \tilde{b}_i^2 = |\tilde{\mathbf{c}}|^2 = c^2. \quad (11)$$

Also in this basis, Eq. (7) becomes

$$\nabla^2 |\mathbf{B}| = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}|} \left(\sum_i \lambda_i^2 - c^2 \right). \quad (12)$$

It is therefore necessary to determine how small $\sum \lambda_i^2$ can be, subject to the constraints (11), $|\tilde{\mathbf{b}}| = 1$, and $\sum \lambda_i = 0$. Using Lagrange multipliers α , β , and γ , define

$$F = \sum_i \lambda_i^2 + \alpha \sum_i \lambda_i + \beta \left(\sum_i \tilde{b}_i^2 - 1 \right) + \gamma \left(\sum_i \lambda_i^2 \tilde{b}_i^2 - c^2 \right). \quad (13)$$

Setting to zero the derivatives of F with respect to the λ_i , the $\tilde{b}_i$, and the multipliers yields the constrained extrema of $\sum \lambda_i^2$. Since it is necessary that at least one of the $\tilde{b}_i$ be nonzero, take $\tilde{b}_1 \neq 0$. Then the optimum solution is $\tilde{b}_2 = \tilde{b}_3 = 0$, $\lambda_1 = c$, and $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = -\lambda_1/2$. This indicates that generally,

$$\sum_i \lambda_i^2 \geq \frac{3}{2} c^2 \quad (14)$$

so that

$$\nabla^2 |\mathbf{B}| \geq \frac{c^2}{2|\mathbf{B}|}. \quad (15)$$

This is the primary result of the paper. In particular, a trap suspending atoms against gravity must satisfy

$$\sum_i \omega_i^2 \geq \frac{mg^2}{2\mu|\mathbf{B}|}, \quad (16)$$

with an analogous statement possible about the strength of the anti-trapping potential for atoms with $\mu < 0$.

For an example of a field which reaches this constraint, consider

$$\mathbf{B} = \left(\frac{c}{2}x - axz \right) \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \left(\frac{c}{2}y - ayz \right) \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \left[B_0 - cz + a \left(z^2 - \frac{x^2 + y^2}{2} \right) \right] \hat{\mathbf{z}}. \quad (17)$$

Such a field can be generated, for instance, at the center of a pair of coaxial coils with unequal currents that are separated by more than the Helmholtz spacing. To second order, the magnitude of the field is

$$|\mathbf{B}| = B_0 - cz + az^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c^2}{4B_0} - a \right) (x^2 + y^2). \quad (18)$$

So if $c = mg/\mu$, atoms will be supported against gravity at the origin. The trap frequencies are then

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_x^2 = \omega_y^2 &= \frac{\mu}{m} \left(\frac{c^2}{4B_0} - a \right) \\ \omega_z^2 &= \frac{2\mu a}{m} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and

$$\sum_i \omega_i^2 = \frac{\mu c^2}{2mB_0} = \frac{mg^2}{2\mu B_0}, \quad (20)$$

which matches (16).

For experimental comparison, Ref. [3] reports a trap for ^{23}Na atoms with oscillation frequencies of 1.81 ± 0.05 Hz, 0.65 ± 0.05 Hz and 1.2 ± 0.1 Hz, yielding $\sum \omega^2 = 201 \pm 12$ s $^{-2}$. The field magnitude was 17 G and the magnetic moment was $\mu_B/2$, so that $mg^2/\mu B_0 = 234$ s $^{-2}$. The reported frequencies thus violate the condition (16) by slightly less than three standard deviations, perhaps due to an unreported uncertainty in the field magnitude. Nonetheless, the two values are within 15% of each other.

It should be noted that the sum of the squares of the trap frequencies is not the only way to measure the trap confinement strength. Indeed, the atomic density in a harmonic trap generally depends on the geometric mean of the trap frequencies, $\bar{\omega} = (\omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3)^{1/3}$. If any one ω_i is zero, then $\bar{\omega}$ is zero. As (19), shows, it is possible to satisfy (16) while either one or two frequencies equal zero, for $a = 0$ and $a = c^2/4B_0$ respectively. However, higher order terms in the potential may still be present. For the above example, when $a = c^2/4B_0$ quartic terms provide confinement in x and y . When $a = 0$, cross terms like $x^2 z$ break the translation symmetry along z . It is therefore

also interesting to consider whether (16) still holds for a potential that is truly flat in one or two dimensions.

A straightforward way to generate true two-dimensional confinement is to use a field whose components are independent of one coordinate in some basis. For instance, the field

$$\mathbf{B} = (cy - 2ayz)\hat{\mathbf{y}} + [B_0 - cz + a(z^2 - y^2)]\hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (21)$$

can be obtained along a line hanging below two long wires stretched along x and separated along y . It has a magnitude (to second order) of

$$|\mathbf{B}| = B_0 - cz + \left(\frac{c^2}{2B_0} - a\right)y^2 + az^2 \quad (22)$$

that is manifestly independent of x . In such a case, the Jacobian matrix J will have, in the appropriate basis, a column consisting only of zeros, since the derivatives with respect to that coordinate vanish. The matrix therefore has one eigenvalue, say λ_3 , that is zero. In this case, the minimization of $\sum \lambda^2$ is straightforward. The trace condition requires $\lambda_1 = -\lambda_2$, so the gradient condition can be written

$$\lambda_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^2 b_i^2 = c^2 \quad (23)$$

and the sum is necessarily less than or equal to one. Thus $\lambda_1^2 \geq c^2$ and $\sum \lambda_i^2 \geq 2c^2$. This requires

$$\nabla^2 |\mathbf{B}| \geq c^2 \quad (24)$$

or

$$\sum_i \omega_i^2 \geq \frac{mg^2}{\mu |\mathbf{B}|}, \quad (25)$$

twice the value as the three-dimensional case. The field (21) satisfies this constraint exactly.

It is possible, however, for the components of the field to vary along a direction while the magnitude of the field does not. For instance, the field

$$\mathbf{B} = B_0 e^{-kz} (\sin ky \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \cos ky \hat{\mathbf{z}}) \quad (26)$$

can be obtained above a surface magnetized with a sinusoidally oscillating pattern along y [15, 16]. Here the field varies with y , but the magnitude

$$|\mathbf{B}| = B_0 e^{-kz} \quad (27)$$

does not. By choosing $k = mg/\mu |\mathbf{B}|$, atoms can be supported against gravity at any desired position z . Since the field here is still independent of x , the argument of the preceding paragraph applies and it can be seen that (26) exactly satisfies the two-dimensional constraint (25). It may be, however, that an analogous three dimensional field configuration exists providing either one- or two-dimensional confinement and with $\sum \omega^2 < mg^2/\mu |\mathbf{B}|$. It has proven difficult to either find such an example or to show that one does not exist.

In conclusion, it has been demonstrated that a magnetic field capable of supporting atoms against gravity will necessarily include a minimum degree of harmonic confinement in at least one direction. It is notable that the confinement can decrease as the magnitude of the field itself increases. This result should prove useful in guiding the design of weakly confining traps for studying extremely low-temperature and low-density gases.

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation and the US Office of Naval Research. The author thanks B. Deissler and O. Garcia for their comments on the manuscript.

-
- [1] M. Inguscio, S. Stringari, and C. E. Wieman, eds., *Bose-Einstein Condensation in Atomic Gases*, vol. CXL of *Proceedings of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi"* (IOS Press, Amsterdam, 1999).
 - [2] V. I. Balykin, V. G. Minogin, and V. S. Letokhov, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **63**, 1429 (2000).
 - [3] A. E. Leanhardt, T. A. Pasquini, M. Saba, A. Schirotzek, Y. Shin, D. Kielpinski, D. E. Pritchard, and W. Ketterle, *Science* **301**, 1513 (2003).
 - [4] J. M. Reeves, O. Garcia, B. Deissler, K. L. Baranowski, K. J. Hughes, and C. A. Sackett, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 051605(R) (2005).
 - [5] T. A. Pasquini, Y. Shin, C. Sanner, M. Saba, A. Schirotzek, D. E. Pritchard, and W. Ketterle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 223201 (2004).
 - [6] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics (Non-relativistic Theory)* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1977), 3rd ed., § 133.
 - [7] E. Tiesinga, B. J. Verhaar, and H. T. C. Stoof, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 4114 (1993).
 - [8] Y. Shin, M. Saba, T. A. Pasquini, W. Ketterle, D. E. Pritchard, and A. E. Leanhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 050405 (2004).
 - [9] M. Saba, T. A. Pasquini, C. Sanner, Y. Shin, W. Ketterle, and D. E. Pritchard, *Science* **307**, 1945 (2005).
 - [10] M. Olshanii and V. Dunjko, eprint cond-mat/0505358.
 - [11] H. J. Metcalf and P. van der Straten, *Laser Cooling and Trapping* (Springer, New York, 1999).
 - [12] T. Bergeman, G. Erez, and H. J. Metcalf, *Phys. Rev. A* **35**, 1535 (1987).
 - [13] W. H. Wing, *Prog. Quant. Elect.* **8**, 181 (1984).
 - [14] W. Ketterle and D. E. Pritchard, *Appl. Phys. B* **54**, 403 (1992).
 - [15] V. V. Vladimirovskii, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **12**, 740 (1961).
 - [16] T. M. Roach, H. Abele, M. G. Boshier, H. L. Grossman, K. P. Zetie, and E. A. Hinds, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 629 (1995).